Michael Ewing
P.O.Box 218
St. Michaels, Md. 21663

7627 Old Receiver Rd., 21701

Dear Mike,

You did not mail your 7/14 until the 20th, which is just as good because it would probably have been added to a stack of put-off work I've begun to attack this a.m.

Some of your letter illustrates what is wrong, dangerous and hurtful about the approach you share with others and the lessons you did not learn from the Braden suit. You make a big thing out of Wrone's book and based on that make many assumptions none of which is true. I did not see it prior to publication and had nothing to do with the preparation of it. While Wrone is more than an "associate" in a sense other than you misuse this - he is a close and cherished friend - the plain and simple truth is that you have again fabricated a nightmare and think of it as a pleasant dream.

If Wrone had consulted me about this I'd have suggested changing the tense of the footnote. With that it would no have been subject to misinterpretation and would also have phrased it differently if he'd asked me. However, he did not use the word "field office," which you do invent by following quotation of what he did say, which is "office" and is ambiguous. Even when you are apparently hard of defending yourself you cannot avoid the falsy in thinking that characterize what I've objected to.

There was little point in your minimum self-serving rhetoric about the 544 address, which I brought to light and you bracket this with the "association," here undefined, between Oswald and Fannie, and need I remind you that I brought that also to light, to the degree it was done with accuracy. Beginning with first mention/ publication.

I do NOT "complain about" attempts "to draw some potential significance" from the building but you put it differently, now as /with "from Marcello's operative Fannie's work out of the small building during the same period in which Oswald used it for his return address." (The only other "potential" significance you attribute to the CIA's.)

The degree to which you persist in factual inaccuracy continues to amaze me and I'm not going to waste time pointing it out. I point out only that Fannie was not and so far as I know never was "Marcello's operative" and did not in the sense you contort all into "work out of the small building" at the time Oswald used that return address, 8/63. Fannie shared Banister's strange views, reportedly did a few jobs for him and was there from time to time but at the time you refer to he was really in G. Wray Gill's office, had and used space there I was told, worked for Gill on occasion and apparently with success because Gill recommended that he be hired for the Marcello defense to "ask Waggoner, who then hired Fannie for that job in which Fannie succeeded. How does this make Fannie "Marcello's operative?"

I'm likely that you and your fellow Keystone Kops, junior grade, did not ask me any questions about this or my work on it for God knows how it would have come out!

I'm glad you do not go for the Lofio Pecora fabrication. The alternative, and I imagine with the totality of my detachment for the young Anglo theorists the only alternative, is your "associate" Holden. I think he went into that with me at some length and it is my recollection attributed it and all of that stuff to you only. I am not in touch with Oglesby and he sends me nothing that he writes.

There is much in life that is easily misinterpreted. For example, what has come to mind with our finally getting city-like addresses. Now I have not moved since 1967 but I've have five different addresses since then. Then there is my envelope, the printing on which some be misinterpreted. To save me money the local printer used type set for my book envelopes, without removing what is, I think, inappropriate. If you look carefully you will see that he did not make this mistake with the earlier original printing of that envelope. It can be taken as putting on air. In fact it is accidental and meaningless.

I have no sensitivity about Willie Weisberg, what you call over-sensitivity. That he was a distant relative means no more than that others were judges, heart-specialists, became wealthy in various businesses and professions and earned respectable fame in various ways. My concern is over the intended mischief involved. I doubt that even as a child I ever saw him. I recall the shame, the fondly sympathy for his father, who I recall from childhood as one of the warmest of humans. I recall his brother became prominent in business circles but I never knew him, either. The only knowledge I have of his career comes from I think an Anderson column, obviously an FBI leak to him of the phone conversation.

While I see nothing in what you say about him that could not have been general knowledge I would now like to know all I can because of what fairly obviously has been launched. However, there is no established relevance of any of this in the JFK assassination and none in anything you have written. I do not hope if anyone will send me the committee's final report and I'm not spending any of my limited resources on its disinformation.

Whether or not it is relevant, and I doubt it, I am interested in proof of your statement that "we do in fact know that at least three (and perhaps more) of the people who worked out of the Camp Street building were being employed by Carlos Marcello." Who are these three and the others possible; what work did they do out of there to be distinguished from dropping in there; them and how were they employed or being employed by Marcello and for what.

There is also the inherent suggestion that when Oswald stamped that address on his leaflets he was serving either Ferrie or Marcello through Ferrie. Or others. Do you intend this? If not what significance do you in all this attempt at self-justification attribute to his use?

Ferrie is dead, as maybe Willie also is. I never heard of his wife and don't know if they had children. I doubt Marcello will sue. But the kind of stuff you really believe and have already gotten you into a libel suit is libel and is neither proven nor even reasonable.

Take all those threats as intended, all the thousands of them. How does the making of a threat establish that it led to the crime?

Have you ever given any thought to the consequences of all this theorizing if you do not theorize the truth? What interest is served by all these conjectures and giving them so much attention aside from drawing attention away from what is real and can have been involved?

Your effort to belabor me over Wrone's footnote represents the kind of false assumption and further building on it from which you apparently will never learn. (I also did not see Howard Roffman's or Sylvia's manuscripts or any others and don't want to.) This is true of your other alleged "associations" and acquaintanceships.

People of all kinds of beliefs once have and use my files or interview me. Inasmuch when these are of the right it is not uncommon for the interview to represent what these people believe rather than what I actually said and some of it has been pretty harmful. There is nothing I can do about it once it is printed. This does not mean I said it, believe it, have been "associated" with these characters or even have an acquaintanceship in the sense you use these words with others. These are commonplaces of life, not the kinds of things on which responsible people undertake to build what they want to believe is responsible work. Take as another example most of the critics. Am I their "associate" or "acquaintance" when we disagree on almost everything and some even regard me as a federal agent?

I appreciate your offer of copies of the stuff you are talking about. I think I'd better be aware of the possibilities of misuse. Of course if you can also show me any real relevance I'd welcome that, too.